

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9, 16, 17, 21, 22, 25, and 26 are currently pending. Claims 25 and 26 have been added; and Claims 10-15, 18-20, 23, and 24 have been withdrawn from consideration. No claims have been amended by the present response, and no new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 16 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0125208 to Malone et al. (hereinafter, "Malone"), U.S. Patent No. 7,093,131 to Kobayashi, and U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0044911 to Takada et al. (hereinafter, "Takada"); Claims 4-6 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malone, Kobayashi, Takada, and U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0199103 to Dube (hereinafter, "Dube"); and Claims 9 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malone, Takada, Kobayashi, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0039929 to Decime (hereinafter, "Decime").

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the interview granted to Applicants' representative on August 26, 2010, at which time the outstanding rejections of Claims 1 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) were discussed, as substantially summarized hereinafter. At the end of the discussion, the Examiner agreed to reconsider the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections based on Takada.

Applicants' Claim 1 is directed to a certification system, comprising in part:

a certificate issuing server, *separate from the information processing equipment*, that issues an electronic certificate to certify an operating environment of the information processing equipment;

...

the certificate issuing server *calculates a location associated with the operating environment of the information processing equipment based on information included in the certification request, and issues the electronic certificate to certify the calculated location associated with the operating environment* of the information processing equipment in response to the certification request of the operating environment transmitted from the information processing equipment. [Emphasis Added].

As discussed during the interview, Claim 1 clarifies that the certificate issuing server, *separate from the information processing equipment*, calculates a location associated with the operating environment of the information processing equipment *based on information included in the certification request*, and issues the electronic certificate to *certify the calculated location* associated with the operating environment of the information processing equipment.

The Office Action acknowledges that any combination of Malone and Kobayashi fails to disclose that the certificate issuing server calculates a location associated with the operating environment of the information processing equipment based on information included in the certification request.¹ Rather, the Office Action asserts that Takada discloses the above claimed features.

Applicants respectfully traverse the above assertions in the Office Action for the following reasons.

In paragraphs [0139] and [0140], Takada describes that the reception of the GPS signal and the calculation of the current position and the current time is completed within the portable phone terminal. Further, Takada describes that a variety of information data (assist information) employed to effectively capture the GPS signal at a high rate may be acquired from the server apparatus 30 so that the GPS signal may be received by means of the assist information.

¹ See Office Action dated June 26, 2009, page 4.

Therefore, as discussed during the interview, in Takada, the calculation of the current position and the current time is completed *within the portable phone terminal* by receiving assist information *from the server apparatus* 30. However, there is *no* disclosure in Takada that the server apparatus, separate from the portable phone terminal, calculates a location associated with the operating environment of the portable phone terminal *based on information included in the certification request* (and issues the electronic certificate to *certify the calculated location* associated with the operating environment of the portable phone terminal).

No matter how the teachings of Malone, Kobayashi, and Takada are combined, the combination does *not* disclose or suggest that the certificate issuing server calculates a location associated with the operating environment of the information processing equipment based on information included in the certification request, and issues the electronic certificate to certify the calculated location associated with the operating environment of the information processing equipment in response to the certification request of the operating environment transmitted from the information processing equipment, as recited in Claim 1.

The above discussion regarding independent Claim 1 also applies to independent Claim 22, which recites analogous features in a claim of a different scope.

For the above reasons alone, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of independent Claims 1 and 22 be withdrawn. In addition, for the reasons discussed above regarding independent Claims 1 and 22, it is respectfully requested that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of dependent Claims 2-9, 16, 17, and 21, which directly or indirectly depend from independent Claim 1, also be withdrawn.

The present amendment adds Claims 25 and 26 for examination on the merits. No new matter has been added. Support for the features recited in claims 25 and 26 is found, for

example, in paragraphs [0062] and [0063] in Applicants' specification, as filed. It is respectfully submitted that the features of Claims 25 and 26 are not described in the art of record, and that these features should be considered and passed to allowance.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 07/09)



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Pranay K. Pattani
Registration No. 66,587